

RECEIVED

FEB 23 2015

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT, SDNY

1 Michael E. Boyd
2 5439 Soquel Drive
Soquel, CA 95073
3 Phone: (408) 891-9677
E-mail: michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net
4 *In Pro Per*

5 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
6 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

7 In re:
8 RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, et al.,
9 Debtors.

Case No. 12-12020 (MG)
Chapter 11
Jointly Administered

10
11 **OPPOSITION OF MICHAEL BOYD SECURED CREDITER TO MOTION**
12 **OF THE RESCAP LIQUIDATING TRUST FOR FINAL DECREE**
13 **CLOSING CERTAIN JOINTLY ADMINISTERED CHAPTER 11 CASES,**
14 **RESCAP BORROWER CLAIMS TRUST'S EIGHTY-SECOND OMNIBUS**
15 **OBJECTION TO CLAIMS (NO LIABILITY BORROWER CLAIMS),**
16 **AND COUNTER MOTION TO HOLD CASE IN ABEYANCE DURING**
17 **PENDANCY OF ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIM BEFORE**
18 **US TREASURY DEPARTMENT**

19
20 **INTRODUCTION**

21 On behalf of and as Trustee to my living trust estate, the Michael Boyd and Patricia Paramoure
22 Living Trust, Michael Boyd, respectfully files this Answer in Opposition to the *ResCap Borrower*
23 *Claims Trust's Motion for Final Decree Closing Certain Jointly Administered Chapter 11 Cases*
24 (*Motion*), filed February 10, 2015, and the *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Eighty-Second*
25 *Omnibus Objection to Claims (No Liability Borrower Claims)*, filed January 29, 2015. Claimant
26 #960 answers in opposition to the *Motion*, the *Omnibus Objection*, and request relief in the form
27 of a stay on further Claims before this Court during the pendency of Claimant's administrative
28 "class claim" before the Department of the Treasury Tort Claims Office received by U.S. Mail on
29 January 28, 2015.

30
31 Purportedly the ResCap Liquidating Trust (the "Liquidating Trust"), successor in interest to the
32 debtors (the "Debtors") in the above-captioned chapter 11 cases (the "Chapter 11 Cases"), filed

1 the Motion for the issuance of a final decree in substantially the form annexed hereto as Exhibit 1
2 (the "Final Decree") closing the Chapter 11 Cases of the Debtors listed on Annex A to the Final
3 Decree (the "Closing Debtors"). [Doc 8107, page 7] In support of this Motion, the Liquidating
4 Trust represents as follows in their Preliminary Statement at paragraph 3.

5 No creditor will be adversely impacted by closing the Chapter 11 Cases of the
6 Closing Debtors because their claims will survive, pursuant to the Plan, against the
7 relevant Debtor Group, and distributions will continue to be made by the
8 Liquidating Trust or Borrower Claims Trust, as applicable, to all creditors pursuant
9 to the terms of the Plan. Further, none of the Closing Debtors are party to any
10 affirmative litigation, and recoveries to creditors will not be affected by granting
11 the relief sought herein. [Doc 8107, page 8]

12 Claimant #960 respectfully disagrees and objects to the Motion on that basis. The Motion is filled
13 with speculative and unsupportable factual statements, these are just a few:

14 The Liquidating Trust or the Borrower Claims Trust as appropriate will make all
15 distributions to holders of Allowed Claims against any of the Closing Debtors and
16 resolve any Disputed Claims against the Closing Debtors. Further, none of the
17 Closing Debtors are party to any affirmative litigations. Accordingly, no creditor
18 will be harmed by the relief sought herein, because the Liquidating Trust or
19 Borrower Claims Trust, as applicable, will make distributions on allowed claims
20 (or claims allowed in the future) as provided for in the Plan." [Doc 8107, page 13]

21
22 "Entry of the Final Decree is thus appropriate here because the Chapter 11 Cases
23 of the Closing Debtors have been "fully administered" within the meaning of
24 section 350(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. Specifically:

- 25 no payments will need to be made by the Closing Debtors on account of
26 Allowed Claims in their cases; and
27 there will be no open adversary proceedings or contested matters pending before
28 the Court in the Closing Debtors' cases.^{[1]3}

29
30 ¹ As of the date hereof, there is one open adversary proceeding in which all of the Debtors are
31 plaintiffs. However, simultaneous herewith, the Liquidating Trust is filing a motion to voluntarily
32 dismiss the open adversary proceeding, Residential Capital, LLC, et al. v. Allstate Ins. Co., et al.,
Case No. 12-01671 (MG).

1 Closing the cases at issue will benefit the estates and Court by reducing the costs
2 and burdens attendant to keeping open the cases of the Closing Debtors where no
3 further relief will be required for the administration of the Closing Debtors'
4 estates. " [Doc 8107, page 13-14 excerpted]

5
6 On January 28, 2015 the Department of the Treasury Tort Claims Office at 1500 Pennsylvania
7 Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20220 received Claimant's administrative Tort "class claim" by
8 U.S. Mail service. [See Attachment 1] Based on this Tort Claim, Claimant contends the burden of
9 proof has shifted from Claimant to the Debtors [aka U.S. Treasury] to demonstrate their action are
10 not based on an unconstitutional animus to borrowers' refunds.

11
12 This claim states, in part

13 My claim is because my house in Soquel CA and Duplex in Sunnyvale CA are
14 being taken by GMAC, AKA ResCap. AKA 74% Owned by Treasury Department
15 through TARP and I am making payments for property that the government
16 defrauded of. Now I didn't know about this until after Jan 30, 2013 when this the
17 Special Inspector General for TARP put out his report. .. See
18 http://www.sigtar.gov/Audit%20Reports/Taxpayers_GMAC.pdf I filed this
19 lawsuit against the Treasury Department Case 1:11-cv-02128-JEB Document 1
20 Filed 11/28/11 <http://www.calfree.com/Stimulus%2520Complaint.pdf>

21
22 The stated basis for the claim

23 This claim is against Treasury's retaliation for protected Free Speech and the
24 unconstitutional animus of government to refunds. [...] ...] Because of the FTCA I
25 can not sue the Treasury without filing this claim first and it being denied. My two
26 properties are worth around a million each and GMAC has extorted around half a
27 million dollars in payments for a total personal and property injury of
28 compensatory value of \$2,500,000 for direct losses. I only have until 3/22/2015 to
29 file for a writ of certiorari to US Supreme Court so if Treasury doesn't answer this
30 Claim before 3/15/2015 claim goes to \$10,000,000 based on Unconstitutional
31 Animus.

1 On January 29, 2015 the *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Eighty-Second Omnibus Objection to*
2 *Claims (No Liability Borrower Claims)* [Doc 8042] Claimant alleges this action was taken in
3 direct retaliation for engaging in protected Free Speech, the right to petition the government for
4 grievances, i.e., Claimant's January 28, 2015 Department of the Treasury Tort Claims Office
5 "class claim". Claimant claims a "class" of seventy two million like situated United States
6 borrowers, based on "\$10,000,000 based on Unconstitutional Animus".
7

8 Claimant previously stated in his June 20, 2014 Objection to Motion /Objection and Opposition
9 to Motion (related document(s) 7036) filed by The Michael Boyd and Patricia Paramoure Living
10 Trust, ("objection") [Doc 7146, page 10]

11 It turns out, the foreclosure crisis, which started and keeps fueling our economic
12 crisis, began over 20 years ago with banks getting federal laws changed to enable
13 them to increase their private gains. They have been defrauding almost everyone
14 possible. Banks began this cycle of fraud by lying to investors (i.e., our Pension
15 Funds) about the Mortgage Backed Securities they sold. All loans in these
16 securitized pools were created to explode/fail, unbeknownst to investors and
17 insurers. Borrowers were forced to refinance prior to loan "explosion/fail dates,"
18 which was exactly why banks created loans like that. Banks then kept all loan
19 ownership records in MERS, a Members Only private database, hiding these
20 records from everyone else. Banks used these loans/notes as collateral for short-
21 term lines of credit instead of transferring the notes to the Mortgage Backed
22 Securities they sold, creating great wealth for themselves, but defrauding both the
23 investors and the IRS. As this scheme began to come apart, banks set up
24 investment departments to "short" the Mortgage Backed Securities they sold,
25 generating additional huge profits for themselves while everyone else lost money.
26 Then banks fraudulently and illegally faked loan ownership paperwork, which
27 they recorded to enable them to foreclose on homes whose loans they did not own
28 (dismissively termed "robo-signing"). Our County Recorder's Offices records are
29 now filled with fraudulent paperwork, jeopardizing ownership for all properties
30 and owners caught in this fraud - which turns out to be as many as 72,000,000
31 properties. [Emphasis added]
32

1 That equated to seven hundred and twenty trillion US dollars. Claimant's evidence is that
2 Unconstitutional Animus against borrower refunds, as a class, as the basis [motive] for the
3 *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Eighty-Second Omnibus Objection* animus, since once again the
4 same claimed basis is "*Res Judicata*" [Doc 8042-2, page 6] and this is despite Claimant's
5 outstanding rights to petition, i.e., the failure to exhaust all other remedies first. *Res Judicata* still
6 does not apply to his claims before this Court because of his failure to exhaust all his available
7 remedies [administrative and judicial] due to his right to file a *Writ of Certiorari* to the U.S.
8 Supreme Court, and additionally because of the pendency of Claimant's administrative Tort
9 "class claim" before the U.S. Treasury Department based on its previous and ongoing
10 unconstitutional animus of U.S. Treasury [aka ResCap] to refunds.

11
12 On January 30, 2015 this unlawful motive became more transparent to this Court once it received
13 Claimant's provided cover letter and a copy of the Department of the Treasury Tort Claim. [Doc
14 8065] This letter attempted in good faith to make clear to the Court that the basis for the claim
15 against ResCap "My claim alleges there is a pattern and practice of the US Treasury acting in
16 retaliation for Claimant's exercise of his protest rights exercised under the First Amendment to
17 the United States Constitution, including but not limited to the right to freedom of speech and the
18 right to petition the government for redress of grievances, and have acted to burden, deter and/or
19 chill the exercise of such free speech rights therein. Claimant alleges there is a pattern and
20 practice of the Respondents engaging in Actions based on an unconstitutional animus, as opposed
21 to a spirit of cooperation free from bias. Claimant, engaged in protected speech, and that the
22 speech was a substantial or motivating factor in an adverse decision taken by the US Treasury
23 Dept. [aka ResCap]² See *Hynes v. Squillace*, 143 F.3d 653, 658 (2d Cir.1998).³ "

24
25 Subsequently to receiving its copy on January 30, 2015 of the Claimant's provided cover letter
26 and a copy of the Department of the Treasury Tort Claim on February 10, 2015 to this Court, the
27 *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Motion for Final Decree Closing* was filed. Claimant further
28 alleges this is evidence of the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's attempts to cover their tracks for
29 their unlawful government sponsored seven hundred and twenty trillion US dollars Ponzi scheme

30
31 ² <http://www.calfree.com/Stimulus%2520Complaint.pdf>
32 ³ http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=7805881731673399158&

1 which threatens to destroy our world's economies, based on this same previous, and ongoing
2 unconstitutional animus of U.S. Treasury [aka ResCap] to refunds.⁴

3

4

Statement of Facts

5 I am not an Attorney, but a Borrower, with pending litigation challenging two of GMAC's no-
6 note Debtor claims against me. GMAC's unlawful acts caused me to file Chapter 13 Bankruptcy
7 in December 2011, prior to ResCap [AKA GMAC LLC] filing Chapter 11 Bankruptcy. So my
8 claims against GMAC LLC are pre-petition for bankruptcy by GMAC LLC. My claim number is
9 960 and was for \$186,000 at the time it was filed.⁵ The amount that I alleged to be defrauded of
10 has increased substantially over that original amount, under my Court approved Bankruptcy Plan.
11 [See Exhibit 1, Court Document 7146.] I still seek the court to return my estate to my living trust
12 and the refund of my payments to GMAC LLC, their successor servicer Ocwen LLC, and a
13 refund of funds paid to my bankruptcy Trustee, due to GMAC LLC's scienter⁶ to defraud me of
14 my estate and my money. While not aware of any other claimant borrower with similar
15 circumstances to my own [with two of GMAC's no-note Debtor claims] with additional unique
16 circumstances as I describe in my claim, and based on recent retaliatory actions taken in response
17 to my exercise of free speech rights by the government it appears that it could be reasonably
18 foreseeable that Claimant's case is the rule of law [not a unique exception to the rule] shared by
19 as many as seventy two million borrowers. On December 22, 2014 the 9th Circuit Denied
20 Rehearing.⁷

21

22

On October 29, 2012 Claimant filed his appeal before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th
23 Circuit in Case# 12-17434 *Michael Boyd v. GMAC Mortgage LLC, et al.* On September 11, 2011,
24 Claimant filed litigation in USDC, Northern District of CA, Case No 5:11-CV-05018, for
25

26

⁴ Galatians 6:7-9 "Do not be deceived, God is not mocked; for whatever a man sows, this he will
also reap. For the one who sows to his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption, but the one
who sows to the Spirit will from the Spirit reap eternal life. Let us not lose heart in doing good,
for in due time we will reap if we do not grow weary...."

27

⁵ See <http://www.kccllc.net/rescap/creditor/search> using that claim number 960 and my claim's
link is as follows: <http://www.kccllc.net/rescap/document/1212032120824150612002131>

28

⁶ Scienter--Scienter is a legal term that refers to intent or knowledge of wrongdoing. This means
that an offending party has knowledge of the "wrongness" of an act or event prior to committing
it.

29

⁷ See http://www.calfree.com/12-17434rehearing_denied.pdf

1 "unconscionability contract and adhesion to real property." Claimant's appeal arose out of his,
2 before Magistrate Judge Paul Singh Grewal, Cause: 15:1601, Truth in Lending. The claims in the
3 complaint were to invalidate/contest the liens on the property that were being serviced by the
4 Debtors. The case was dismissed with prejudice on August 22, 2012 by Order Granting
5 Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs First Amended Complaint. Claimant appealed the
6 District Court's decision to the USCA, 9th Circuit, Case No 12-17434. The Ninth Circuit
7 affirmed, by an unpublished Memorandum, the district court's order dismissing the case on
8 August 22, 2014.

9
10 On June 20, 2014 Claimant filed with the Court Document 7146, Objection to Motion /Objection
11 and Opposition To Motion (related document(s)7036) filed by The Michael Boyd and Patricia
12 Paramoure Living Trust, ("objection").

13
14 On September 17, 2014 Debtors filed the *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Seventy-Fifth*
15 *Omnibus Objection to Claims (No Liability Borrower Claims)* (the "*Omnibus Objection*") which
16 included [at Doc 7552-2 pp 45-46] again, a disallowance of the Claim 960, on the basis of "*Res*
17 *Judicata*", with "No Liability Summaries".

18
19 In the Court's December 11, 2014, *Memorandum Opinion and Order Overruling the Rescap*
20 *Borrower Claims Trust's Objection to Claim No. 960 Filed by Michael Boyd* it states:

21 "Boyd argues correctly (and the Trust concedes) that the judgment dismissing the
22 California Action is not final, and therefore *res judicata* does not apply on the basis
23 of such dismissal, because Boyd's Petition for Rehearing remains pending. (See
24 Opp. at 4; Reply ¶ 19.)" [Doc. 7859, page 3, 1st paragraph]

25 As Claimant explains in more detail in his arguments, *res judicata* still does not apply to his
26 claims before this Court because of his failure to exhaust all his available remedies due to his
27 right to file a *Writ of Certiorari* to the U.S. Supreme Court, and additionally because of the
28 pendency of Claimant's administrative Tort "class claim" before the U.S. Treasury Department
29 based on its previous and ongoing unconstitutional animus of U.S. Treasury [aka ResCap] to
30 refunds.

In the Court's December 11, 2014, *Memorandum Opinion and Order Overruling the Rescap Borrower Claims Trust's Objection to Claim No. 960 Filed by Michael Boyd* it states:

The remainder of Boyd's arguments make very little sense. He invokes "his First Amendment rights to judicial review [right to petition for grievances against the government, AKA ResCap] under the Supreme Clause." (See Opp. at 4.) Boyd appears to argue that the Debtors are majority-owned by the United States government, their actions are thereby executive or legislative acts, and this Court has a mandate to review such acts for Constitutional infringements. (See *id.*) Boyd also asserts that it is unclear how *res judicata* applies due to confirmation of his Chapter 13 Plan, noting that he filed for bankruptcy protection before the Debtors filed their chapter 11 cases. (See *id.* at 4–5.) [Doc. 7859, page 3, 2nd paragraph]

On January 28, 2015 the Department of the Treasury Tort Claims Office at 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20220 received Claimant's administrative Tort "class claim" by U.S. Mail service. [See Attachment 1 for proof of receipt signed for by: C GENTRY]

On January 29, 2015 the *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Eighty-Second Omnibus Objection to Claims (No Liability Borrower Claims)* [Doc 8042]

Answer to Objections, Opposition, and Arguments

Answer to *Omnibus Objection* first, due to the pendency of Claimant's Petition for Panel Rehearing, Debtors disallowance of the claim on the basis of "*Res Judicata*" is premature,

In the Court's December 11, 2014, *Memorandum Opinion and Order Overruling the Rescap Borrower Claims Trust's Objection to Claim No. 960 Filed by Michael Boyd* it states "The remainder of Boyd's arguments make very little sense. He invokes "his First Amendment rights to judicial review [right to petition for grievances against the government, AKA ResCap] under the Supreme Clause." (See Opp. at 4.)" By this Claimant clarifies his meaning by stating Claimant was attempting to invoke his First Amendment rights to judicial review [right to petition for grievances against the government, AKA ResCap] under the Supremacy Clause.

1 As claimant pointed out at page 8 line 24 of his June 20 objections the Petitioner ResCap is "74%
2 owned by taxpayers" which is relevant to the separation of powers, the political doctrine of
3 constitutional law under which the three branches of government (executive, legislative, and
4 judicial) are kept separate to prevent abuse of power. Also known as the system of checks and
5 balances, each branch is given certain powers so as to check and balance the other branches.

6
7 Under this doctrine Judicial Review is the idea, fundamental to the US system of government
8 that the actions of the executive and legislative branches of government are subject to review and
9 possible invalidation by the judicial branch. Judicial review allows the Supreme Court to take an
10 active role in ensuring that the other branches of government abide by the constitution. Judicial
11 review was established in the classic case of *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 US 137 (1803).

12
13 A court's authority [including this one's] is to examine an executive or legislative act and to
14 invalidate that act if it is contrary to constitutional principles. The power of courts of law to
15 review the actions of the executive and legislative branches is fundamental to judicial review.
16 Though judicial review is usually associated with the U.S. Supreme Court, which has ultimate
17 judicial authority, it is a power possessed by most federal and state courts of law in the United
18 States. In the United States, the supremacy of national law is established by Article VI, Clause 2,
19 of the U.S. Constitution. Called the Supremacy Clause, it states that "This Constitution, and the
20 laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof ... shall be the supreme law
21 of the land."

22
23 It still is unclear to Claimant how Debtors objection is relevant to Debtors disallowance of the
24 claim on the basis of "*Res Judicata*". Irrespective of the fact "Claimant affirmed the liens, as the
25 Plan provides that all arrears on the loans will be paid and Claimant will make ongoing payments
26 on the loans" this should in no way diminish Claimant's right to this Court's review of his Claim
27 on the basis of the facts before it now. Claimant filed bankruptcy protection before the Debtors
28 did, so now the Debtors want to abuse the process for their advantage, which by itself should be
29 improper, but for the government [AKA ResCap] to do so violates the Constitution.

30
31 Claimant's bankruptcy, like the Debtors', is voluntary, the fact Claimant's affirmed the liens, as
32 the Plan provides, does not diminish Claimant's rights before the US bankruptcy Court, nor the

1 US Supreme Court, nor in his administrative "class claim" before the Department of the Treasury
2 Tort Claims Office. The fact that Debtors are 74% owned by the federal government, should
3 diminish Debtors rights and should also entitle these matters to a higher [not lower] standard of
4 review pursuant to the Supremacy Clause, since in ResCap's [Aka the Government's] filing in my
5 bankruptcy, the Debtors misrepresented the contents of their proof of claims to this Bankruptcy
6 Court, what Mr. Paatalo characterized as "Dubious endorsements", as well as misrepresented the
7 facts regarding "all payments 'due' on the debts are being timely paid to, and received by, the
8 certificate holders /investors in the HVMLT 2007-4 Trust during the pendency of the Boyd
9 bankruptcy."

22
23 Mr. Paatalo's analysis goes on to explain the reasoning for his findings in regards to the proof of
24 claims and payments issues with reference to his provided exhibits to provide supporting
25 evidence for his findings are described in more detail at pages 7 line 19 through to page 10 line 7
26 of the Affidavit of William J. Paatalo.

Conclusions and Requests for Relief

29 Wherefore, for the reasons and proof presented, I respectfully request the court deny and overrule
30 the *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Eighty-Second Omnibus Objection to Claims* (the "Omnibus
31 *Objection*") filed January 29, 2015 as to Claim 960, deny the *ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's*
32 *Motion for Final Decree Closing Certain Jointly Administered Chapter 11 Cases* filed February

1 10, 2015, and in the alternative the Court grant Claimant's claim on the basis of the facts and
2 evidence presented, and grant the requested relief in the form of a stay on further Claims before
3 this Court during the pendency of Claimant's administrative "class claim" before the Department
4 of the Treasury Tort Claims Office received by U.S. Mail on January 28, 2015, or any other relief
5 the Court finds appropriate.

6

7 Also, I respectfully request the incorporation of requested additional Attachment 1 hereto be
8 incorporated herein.

9

10  /s/ Michael E. Boyd

11 Michael E. Boyd
12 5439 Soquel Drive
Soquel, CA 95073
Phone: (408) 891-9677
13 E-mail: michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net

14 DATED: February 19, 2015

15

16 **Affidavit of Michael Boyd**

17 I affirm under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct. Executed on February 19,
18 2015 at Soquel, California.

19

20  /s/ Michael E. Boyd

21 Michael E. Boyd
22 5439 Soquel Drive
Soquel, CA 95073
Phone: (408) 891-9677
23 E-mail: michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

1 Attachment 1
2
3
4
5

6 Tracking Number: EK396886163US

7  DELIVERED

8 Updated Delivery Day: Wednesday, January 28, 2015

9 Scheduled Delivery Day: Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 10:00 pm

Money Back Guarantee

Signed for By: C GENTRY JR WASHINGTON, DC 20220 at 4:14 am

10 Product & Tracking Information

11 Available Actions

12 Postal Product:

Priority Mail Express 1-Day™

13 Features:

PO Box Accepted

Return Receipt

Up to \$100 Insurance Included

Restrictions Apply

14 Proof of Delivery

0

15 Test Updates

0

16 Email Updates

0

DATE & TIME	STATUS OF ITEM	LOCATION
January 28, 2015, 4:14 am	Delivered	WASHINGTON, DC 20220

17 Your item was delivered at 4:14 am on January 28, 2015 in WASHINGTON, DC 20220 to TREASURY 20220
PU. The item was signed for by C GENTRY.

January 27, 2015, 10:55 am	Available for Pickup	WASHINGTON, DC 20220
January 27, 2015, 10:59 am	Arrived at Post Office	WASHINGTON, DC 20220
January 27, 2015, 8:15 pm	Arrived at USPS Facility	WASHINGTON, DC 20220
January 28, 2015, 10:01 pm	Departed USPS Facility	SAN JOSE, CA 95101
January 28, 2015, 1:51 pm	Arrived at USPS Origin Facility	SAN JOSE, CA 95101
January 28, 2015, 2:15 pm	Departed Post Office	SOQUEL, CA 95073
January 28, 2015, 2:33 pm	Arrived at USPS Origin Facility	SOQUEL, CA 95073

1
2
3
4
5
Attachment 1

6
7
8
9
10
Text Only

11 Tracking Number: EK596886163US

12 **delivered**

- Updated Delivery Day: Wednesday, January 28, 2015
- Scheduled Delivery Day: Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 12:00 pm
- Money Back Guarantee
- Signed for By: C GENTRY // WASHINGTON, DC 20220 // 4:14 am

13 **Product & Tracking Information**

14 **Postal Product:**

- Priority Mail Express 1-Day™

15 **Features:**

- PO to Addressee
- Return Receipt
- Up to \$100 insurance included
Restrictions Apply Priority Mail Express Insurance info icon

Date & Time	Status of Item	Location
January 28, 2015 , 4:14 am	Delivered	WASHINGTON, DC 20220
Your item was delivered at 4:14 am on January 28, 2015 in WASHINGTON, DC 20220 to TREASURY 20220 PU. The item was signed for by C GENTRY.		
January 27, 2015 , 10:55 am	Available for Pickup	WASHINGTON, DC 20220
January 27, 2015 , 10:29 am	Arrived at Post Office	WASHINGTON, DC 20018
January 27, 2015 , 8:15 am	Arrived at USPS Facility	WASHINGTON, DC 20074
January 26, 2015 , 10:55 pm	Departed USPS Facility	SAN JOSE, CA 95101
January 26, 2015 , 3:32 pm	Arrived at USPS Origin Facility	SAN JOSE, CA 95101
January 26, 2015 , 3:15 pm	Departed Post Office	SOQUEL, CA 95073
January 26, 2015 , 2:41 pm	Arrived at USPS Origin Facility	SOQUEL, CA 95073
January 26, 2015 , 2:23 pm	Acceptance	SOQUEL, CA 95073